

Serial No.: 09/882,138  
Docket No.: 26769-01A

Examiner: J. Amini  
Art Unit: 2672

### REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-4, 6-8, and 12-18, 22-24, and 28-44 are currently pending in this application. Claims 1, 3-4, 6-8, 22, 28, and 38 have been amended, claims 9-10, 19-21, and 25-27 have been canceled, and new claims 41-44 has been added.

The claims have been amended to more clearly define the invention and no new matter is believed to have been added by virtue of these amendments.

### Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 1, 3-4, 6-10, and 12-40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kanno et al. in view of Ohnishi et al.

With respect to claims 1, 22, and 28, the Examiner asserts that Applicants do not specify that the first and second image segments are printed at different times from each other. While Applicants believe that the disclosure and the claims clearly indicate that the first image segment is printed before the second image segment (claims 22 and 28 clearly recite this sequence), in the interest of furthering prosecution, Applicants have amended claim 1 to recite that after printing the first image segment, the second image segment is printed. Thus, it is clear that the printing steps occur sequentially and not at the same time. The claims have also been amended to more clearly define the buffer region.

Applicants respectfully submit that Kanno does not describe or suggest printing a first image segment onto a photosensitive surface and then printing the second image segment onto the photosensitive surface in the manner described and claimed by Applicants. As set forth in Kanno beginning at column 25, line 45, once all of the documents that make up the final image are stored in memory, a composite image is generated and the composite image is then printed by the printer section. Thus, Kanno only describes generating and printing a composite image, and does not describe or suggest printing one section and then printing a second section. Furthermore, Ohnishi

(W1394029;1)

Serial No.: 09/882,138  
Docket No.: 26769-01A

Examiner: J. Amini  
Art Unit: 2672

does not print a first image segment and then a second image segment as recited in the claimed invention, but only stores the image segments in memory and then prints the "composite" image on the substrate.

Claims 22 and 28 already affirmatively recited that the first image segment is printed and then (after indexing the printing device and the photosensitive surface relative to one another) the second image segment is printed. As discussed above, this feature is not described or suggested by either Kanno or Ohnishi. Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner has not shown that the references describe or suggest the features of the pixel counter, integrator, multiplier, and intensity modulator affirmatively recited in these claims.

Because claims 1, 22, and 28 are believed to be allowable over the prior art of record for the reasons provide above, claims 3-4, 6-8, and 12-18, 23-24, and 29-40 which depend directly or indirectly from these claims are also believed to be allowable over the prior art of record. Applicants also respectfully disagree with the assertions made by the Examiner regarding many of the rejected dependent claims. For the purpose of streamlining prosecution, these claims are not discussed in detail, but Applicants reserve all rights to continue to dispute the teachings of the references as they pertain to these claims.

For all of these reasons, it is believed that 1, 3-4, 6-8, and 12-18, 22-24, and 28-40 are patentable over the teachings of Kanno in view of Ohnishi. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 3-4, 6-8, and 12-18, 22-24, and 28-40 as being unpatentable over Kanno in view of Ohnishi is respectfully requested.

New claim 41 is similar in scope to claim 1 and is also believed to be allowable over the prior art of record for the reasons discussed above. Likewise, claims 42-44, which depend directly or indirectly from claim 41 are also believed to be allowable over the prior art of record.

{W1394029;1}

Serial No.: 09/882,138  
Docket No.: 26769-01A

Examiner: J. Amini  
Art Unit: 2672


**Conclusion**

Applicant believes that the foregoing is a full and complete response to the Office Action of record. Accordingly, an early and favorable reconsideration of the rejection of the claims is requested. Applicants believe that claims 1, 3-4, 6-8, and 12-18, 22-24, and 28-44 are now in condition for allowance and an indication of allowability and an early Notice of Allowance of all of the claims is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner perceives of any reason why such allowance should not be granted he is requested to contact the undersigned at (203) 575-2648 for a telephonic interview prior to issuance of the next office action.

Early and favorable action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,

  
Jennifer Calcagni, Reg. No. 50,207  
Carmody & Torrance, LLP  
50 Leavenworth Street  
Waterbury, CT 06721-1110  
(203) 575-2648